

## REVIEW

### ACADEMIC INSULAE: THE SEARCH FOR A PARADIGM IN AND FOR TOURISM STUDIES

VINCENT PLATENKAMP

Cross-cultural Understanding, NHTV University of Applied Sciences, Breda, The Netherlands

---

Epistemological relativism in tourism studies has been conceivably paralyzed by the concept of a, or, the “paradigm.” In this review article, Platenkamp metaphorically identifies these paradigms with the islands that Odysseus visited (all those centuries ago) during his well-recorded journey to Ithaca. In this context, therefore, Ithaca is changed (by Platenkamp) from being just an idyllic Greek homeland into a contemporary, hybridized world like—in our time—of the multilayered network society in Africa of the capital of Ghana, Kumasi. The basic question for Platenkamp, then, is that of how tourism studies researchers can (or ought?) leave their safe islands (i.e., their paradigms) and organize their own *paradigm dialog* (after Guba) with others around them on their uncertain and risky voyage to Kumasi. In an attempt to clarify this vital kind of dialog, Platenkamp introduces Said’s principles of reception and resistance, but also focuses on the distinction between different modes of “knowledge production” that have been introduced into the social sciences since the 1990s. In this light, to Platenkamp, the uncertainty of this ongoing/unending epistemological quest remains crucial: to him, all (almost all?) believers in a, or any, paradigm within tourism studies are unhealthily “overimmunized” by the tall claims and the perhaps undersuspected strategies of the particular “paradigm” they follow. (Abstract by the Reviews Editor)

Key words: Odyssey of tourism studies; Research paradigm; Paradigm dialog; Reception and resistance; Modes 1, 2, and 3 of knowledge production; Said

---

#### Introduction

When Odysseus left Trojan he (the gods) chose his uncertain way back to his Penelope by the sea. The sea is, on the one hand, symbolical for adventure, heroism, and a quest for the unknown. But

it also stands for danger, threats, and complete chaos. During this voyage on the sea many events occurred on specific islands that seemed to offer hospitality and security. At the same time the reader realizes that this security is fake and that Odysseus would use his clever mind in the ultimate moment

Address correspondence to Dr. Vincent Platenkamp, Associate Professor of Cross-cultural Understanding, NHTV, University of Applied Sciences, Mgr. Hopmansstraat 1: 4817 JT, Breda, The Netherlands. Fax: 0031(0)765332295; E-mail: [platenkamp.v@nhtv.nl](mailto:platenkamp.v@nhtv.nl)

in order to escape the new dangers. When Odysseus had to sail between the dangerous cliffs of Scylla and Charybdis and he realized the dangers of this part of the journey, he blindfolded his men, who were rowing their way through this rough sea on his command, and he himself was tied to the ship's mast so that he could lead his men without being able to react to the captivating and enchanting sounds of the sirens on land. In this way he used his ratio, his reason, to mislead the powers of the gods. Horkheimer and Adorno (1969) referred to this clever use of the ratio by misleading the powerful gods as to the origins of a type of capitalist, instrumental rationality. The powers (gods) of nature can be controlled by man through his rational capacities? By ignoring the overwhelming power of the gods and concentrating on the most efficient means to survive, instrumental rationality became dominant.

The island of Ithaca, where Penelope waits for her husband, will be the ultimate aim in this article, although there are many moments during Odysseus' journey that he doubts this result. For social sciences this implies that at the moment of arrival in Ithaca, at last if possible at all, we could speak about a safe and sound paradigm in a period of normal science on land. For the philosopher Kuhn (1962) a period of normal science indicates the maturity of a scientific program, a paradigm. However, before this happy end we will have to travel in a preparadigmatic situation on the sea, where sometimes we—as Odysseus—will stay in an assumed paradigm on a faraway island. We should know that there are many more islands that are attractive where no island is capable of keeping Odysseus on its shores. In the meantime we think that our island is the paradigm, because the gods of nature have made us asleep in order to keep us away from traveling. And in the end: will there be a happy ending on Ithaca after all?

In our Odyssey of tourism studies we will be guided by the two main (rational) principles of Said (2004): reception and resistance. We will be seduced by the strong powers of the text that belong to a specific island. Reception, then, implies an openness to receive the intentions and meanings of that text. At the same time we will have our own thoughts and resist to conclusions that would reject them too easily. In each text we will be insider and

outsider at the same time. First, we will be taken away by the charms and attractions of this text, but at the end we will wake up, realize that we did not arrive at Ithaca yet, and continue our journey to the next stage.

Is a paradigm in normal sciences, as Kuhn (1962) meant it to be, only realizable in natural sciences and not in social sciences, let alone tourism studies? Why are concerns of paradigm relevant for the studies of tourism analysis or tourism management? What if there would be no paradigm at all in this field? "Evidence-based" policy would be without serious value, if it would only consist of empirical generalizations without any theoretical support or significance for the longer term. The difference between art critique, interpretive science, and sophisticated journalism would be without value.

Maybe we should not yet announce in this introduction a final answer like "anything goes" (Feyerabend, 1975) in tourism studies, but wait and see what the journey will bring us. Odysseus, then, stands for the tourism scientist who, after the visit of each island, reflects upon the qualities of the so-called paradigm of this island.

#### Said and Mode 1, 2, and 3 in Knowledge Production

According to Popper (1972), scientific objectivity refers to the scientific method and not to the individual or group consciousness, although it also is related to the social aspect of his scientific method. Science has its own logical structure, which has to be distinguished from its social backgrounds. Kuhn (1962) opposes Popper in this sense, where he states that the choices between scientific theories can only be understood by referring to these social and psychological backgrounds. For him there is no internal logical structure, based on a criterion like falsifiability. His thesis of the *incommensurability* of scientific theories indicates the logical impossibility of these logical choices between theories. According to Feyerabend (1975), whose epistemological anarchism is more clarifying, there is no final criterion whatsoever. In some circumstances it would be advisable to protest against the suppressing dominance of positivist thinking; in others it might be good to use positivism against speculative thinking. The same goes for

the other islands of thought in the tourism academy. For Kuhn (1962), after a short scientific revolution scientists enter a completely new world; acquire a totally different worldview that is incomparable to the previous one. Kuhn illustrates this paradigm switch through a much criticized “Gestalt Switch.” Since then others, like Foucault (1966), introduced a more nuanced picture of how fields of knowledge and power change.

In this review article a distinction is being made between natural and social sciences, including the tourism academy. In natural sciences, with its strong capacity of testability (falsifiability) of their amazingly well developed and internally coherent theories, Popper’s (1972) concept of science seems to be the most reasonable one. Or, in Kuhn’s (1962) words here one may speak of paradigms. In social sciences one cannot. The situation is more of a preparadigmatic status. For example, in sociology there never has been a paradigm and in psychology maybe Darwinism (a biological paradigm) is strong enough as supporting the more behaviorist tendencies in this discipline. In social sciences incommensurability paves the way for the relativity of each theory. Feyerabend’s (1975) “anything goes” needs to be interpreted as a device against any scientific repression. The same goes for the islands of thought in the tourism academy. Therefore, in social sciences it remains more accepted to talk about “paradigms” as if you can make yourself immune to criticism by hiding behind the walls of your own assumptions. That is why the “paradigm dialog” (Guba, 1990) should become a crucial concept in social sciences if you do not accept this lack of confrontation between theoretical traditions. The question of how to organize a rational discussion between differing theoretical traditions that hide themselves on isolated islands becomes more relevant than ever before in social sciences and in the tourism academy for that reason.

In this context the principles of Said (2004) of reception and resistance are the first tools to organize this discussion. Being open to each theoretical tradition while at the same time not losing one’s resistance, based on one’s own insights, is a first way of opening up this discussion. Especially through hermeneutics and the “interpretive turn” we can learn from this open and critical attitude in the dialog between “paradigms.” But furthermore, the

distinction between different modes of knowledge production (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010; Kunneman, 2005) contributes to the structuring of this discussion “between paradigms.” In mode 1 academic discussions take place via peer-reviewed articles, conferences, books, and reference to scientific methods. In the tourism academy the “interpretive turn” also claims room for her criteria in this mode of argumentation. In mode 2 highly sophisticated, professional discussions take place in a situation of knowledge production where various parties (among others, the academic one) are stimulated to partake in this discussion from their own professional perspectives. In mode 3 existential and moral discussions can take place that are excluded from the other two modes. The different islands of knowledge production contribute each in their own way to these various modes. Nevertheless, some choices also need to be made that are not in line with the own assumptions. After each visit to one of the islands the clever Odysseus will be asked to use Said’s (2004) principles and the three modes of knowledge production in his reflections about the contribution of his visit to the “paradigm dialog.”

#### The Island of Nomothetic Deduction in Tourism: Critical Rationalism and Postpositivism?

The island of modern science came into being during the 17th century. In Western Europe a new mode of nature knowledge grew out of a changing speculative background, the mathematization of knowledge, and an empirical search for data (Cohen, 2010). This unique combination started to be called natural sciences. The influence of this island has been immense, also in the social sciences. Since the 19th century the causal model of explanation has been imitated in social sciences and in the tourism academy, but in a defective manner. Empirical generalizations were taken for theories and “arm-chair theories” were hardly tested at all, where Big Brother—the natural sciences—had coherent nomothetic deductive theories (Einstein, Bohr, Darwin) that were thoroughly tested as well. Since the 20th century Popper’s (1972) justification of this science counts probably as the best one. For him, testability implies the falsifiability of competing theoretical research programs. In social sciences this does not really work, because the competing theories are

all too ready to consider themselves as paradigms, which enable scientists to work within their own background assumptions as puzzle solvers. But in the tourism academy this is even worse. Where are the tourism big theories? The best way of dealing with this question is, of course, by implementing the social theories in tourism. Apart from that there are some models (empirical generalizations), like Butler's (2006) life-cycles of tourism destinations, that have proven some theoretical insight and practical use. But there are no well-tested big theories about tourism either. Therefore, in a more modest way, Greene (Guba, 1990), Cook (1985), and others speak about *small theories* within a frame of methodological multiplism. The interesting point in this proposal is the reference to the critical tradition with its "evaluative challenges and unsuccessful refutations" (Guba, 1990, p. 231). In this way the organized criticism as an important characteristic of the scientific enterprise will be methodologically warranted, apart from the social organization through peer-reviewed articles and conferences where pluralism reigns as well. This remains the strongest point of this island to be considered by the whole archipelago of the tourism academy. On the other hand, the differences with Big Brother, the natural sciences, should also make the inhabitants of this island more modest in their sometimes ridiculous pretensions towards the other inhabitants of the archipelago. Deduction in (postpositivistic) social sciences and in tourism studies becomes a huge if not impossible task when you realize that "theoretical development often takes place without empirical testing and in a parallel process empirical research takes place outside of theoretical development" (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012, p. 55). There is nothing wrong with the quantitative preference for mainly surveys on this island. But one has to realize that in social sciences there are more methodological opportunities to discover the social world of tourism.

### The Island of Critical Theory

Critical Theory in international tourism studies broke through during conferences from 2005 on in Croatia (and one in Cardiff). These islanders originated in Frankfurt, Germany, during the 1920s and 1930s. Since then they lost many of their ideological

feathers like the belief in the revolutionary force of the laboring class or the loss of a critical consciousness caused by a massive culture industry. The last turbulent influence came from postmodernism and its relativist attacks on the absolute claims of all ideologies, Marxism included. The conferences in tourism studies could be seen as an attempt to revitalize this critical tradition after all these historical changes.

According to Kolakowski (1978), Critical Theory minimally meant:

1. An historical perspective on developments and contradictions in society but at the same time an independent position towards any doctrine, including Marxism.
2. The insaneness of society and the need for radical, emancipatory change.
3. The analysis of existing society itself is part of that society and thereby requires self-reflection.

During the first meeting of the field's *academy for tourism studies*, the third point (i.e., reflexivity and the relations between the social researcher and the social world) was highlighted in many articles. Moreover, "critical arguments against the current forms of tourism were mounted by invoking proposals that went beyond the business logics of tourism management" (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012, p. 45). To conclude, many theoretical influences from qualitative methodology to various new philosophies like postmodernism, poststructuralism, or deconstruction have been considered in diverse tourism debates as in dark tourism, "voluntourism," and alternative tourism.

Critical Theory asserted that disinterested scientific research was impossible in a society that is in need for change. It disputes the fact-value separation and tries to find a normative position between the many voices that should be taken into account in a globalizing world. When facts should be analyzed in a context of their production within power relations, however, it becomes impossible to relate to a powerless position, free from ideology, from where to start a universal and emancipatory critique. This point of critique accentuates the importance of Habermas' procedural rationality. For him there are no criteria of universal criticism anymore but one can strive for a universal discourse, free from power, where members attempt to critically

produce the best possible (rational) world through their communicative action. The question, then, is whether this communicative action will be capable of countering the colonizing power of the political and economic system. The critical impulse in critical thinking still seems to be worthwhile, also in tourism studies. Mode 3 of knowledge production (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010) promises to offer a structured manner to cherish this critical impulse in tourism discussions on this island.

#### Preparadigmatic Turns in the Tourism Academia: The Interpretive Turn, Learning From Humanities

Looking back it took the tourism academia a long time to understand that its linguistic, critical, or interpretive “turns” in fact were logical phenomena that highlighted the preparadigmatic state of this academy. The controversy “interpretation versus explanation,” for example, is inherently part of the divergent ways of approaching tourism as part of the social world. There are many forgotten thinkers on the interpretive island who have been important in our interpretive understanding of this world. Take Merleau-Ponty (1945), the French philosopher. For him “meaning,” which is a crucial concept on this island, cannot be found behind phenomena but is coming down into the world, because we are looking for her via the body. Through our body we get access to the things we perceive and the perceiver cannot be separated from the thing he perceives, as has been done in objective thinking. The body is with us and as far as we are “with the world” through our body and perceive the world through it we are experiencing the world. Perception is coexistence with the world, while experiencing colors like our body experiences them. Cézanne said in the same spirit that an image can even catch the smell of a landscape.

Through philosophers like Merleau-Ponty it becomes clear why interpretations of meanings are relevant in our understanding of the social world. Phenomenology, but also hermeneutics, has been forgotten too long. Therefore, the humanities on this island are in a serious need of reappraisal in order to improve the defective perceptions and the understanding of the rich and meaningful phenomena in social life, like in tourism. The study of social life is a “hall of mirrors” (Geertz, 1983), in

which the interpretive turn has just been a starting point. Hermeneutics is an interesting approach on this island. For example, in the field of cultural heritage many stakeholders have their own perspectives that color their expectations. In Levuka on the Fiji islands (Fisher, 2004) these different groups need to be understood in order to manage the colonial heritage. More general, many interpretive understandings in our hybrid network society are in a growing need of mutual interpretations. This process of interpretation is captured in a “hermeneutical circle,” in which all participants constantly (re)interpret each other’s interpretations. The subjective “biases” of the psychologists are not taken as something to actively avoid in one’s (objective) perception, but as a rich source of information that should be made explicit from within the “Fragehorizont” (Gadamer, 1990) or “question horizon” of the participants in this process of interpretation. Much interpretive tourism research still needs to be done on this rich and beautiful island as very well understood by Jamal and Hollinshead (2001). Various methods are developed and will be developed, like autoethnography, ethnomethodology, grounded theory, narrative inquiry, phenomenology, visual methods, and many more.

In constructionism, an emergent approach on this island, the main thesis is that the meaning of the social world is not discovered but is constructed by history, society, ideas, and language. Worldmaking (Hollinshead, 2009) is a critical and creative concept that (should) inspire many qualitative/interpretive/phenomenological researchers in this context. The interesting limit to this thought, however, remains the objection that at the horizon of each perspective there is a (partly irrational) reality independent of the mind (Platenkamp & Botterill, 2013).

#### Islands of National Tourism Discourse: Hidden Knowledge and the Lingua Franca?

This is the island of “the international classroom of tourism studies” (Lengkeek & Platenkamp, 2004). Students and researchers from all over the globalizing world flock together here in order to develop the best possible understandings of tourism as a phenomenon, embedded in an economic, political, social, and cultural environment. English seems to have become the “lingua franca” of this



diverse island community. This facilitates the communication within this community and enables “scientific” discussions across borders. It also contains the promise of a universal discourse that is so important for the best possible type of argumentation possible. On the other hand there are threats to this thought, related to the neglect of other language communities with their own rich intellectual traditions. How do you incorporate the voices of these traditions into the lingua franca? Can you refer in your peer reviewed articles to the important cultural gatekeepers of your own tradition when their voices are not translated yet into English? And what does that mean, translation? The “continental” philosophy is only taken seriously when some works are translated into English. Foucault, for example, has been extendedly discussed in a French philosophical and other context before his first books have been translated. How could one translate that type of discussion into the English language community?

From a cultural point of view much knowledge has been internalized from various national, local, gender specific, postcolonial, and more backgrounds. These hidden background assumptions are a rich source to be explored in this international community. Much research is needed in this area, from all the other islands and more islands that have been neglected in this article. Tourism studies could profit from this emergent field of interest. This island still is a relatively small island, but with a promising future if the biases from all participants are treated in a hermeneutical manner and if the researchers do not stop with asking questions once they have found some “dimensions” of (national) cultural variation (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

### Does Ithaca Exist? Back to Odysseus’ Journey

Since its origins in the 19th century social sciences (and later: tourism studies) have been (too much) influenced by natural sciences and (too little) by the humanities. Apart from this a theoretical tradition emerged, such as the sociological tradition (Nisbett, 1966), that contained many challenging theories like structural functionalism, Marxism, Critical Theory and Habermas, poststructuralism and Foucault, figurationalism, and Freudianism. These theories will

never acquire the scientific reputation of the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, or of Darwinism and therefore the term “tradition” instead of “paradigm” seems to be a good alternative. In this tradition “anything goes” because criticism remains a crucial element, even if consensus would be impossible about philosophical backgrounds or methodological principles. Nevertheless it remains relevant to look upon this tradition as a coherent one that is, in a continuous changing journey, strongly related to what happens in everyday life and its often capricious and irrational reality.

Odysseus’ travels are symbolical in this quest for knowledge. In spite of the strong, irrational forces, symbolized by the struggle between the Greek gods, during his journey this clever hero used his rational capacities in order to mislead the overwhelming influences of the gods. In this article the way this can be done in the case of tourism studies has been explored by implementing the basic principles of reading a text as Said (2004) proposes them, reception and resistance. On each island a very incomplete attempt has been made to receive some important insights through empathy with the background assumptions. At the same time a critical resistance remains a focal point of interest that should bring us a step further in the “intersubjective” dialog between the different “paradigms” (Guba, 1990). The islands are part of an archipelago of tourism studies that promises to create the best possible world that in the end would appear to be our existent world. However, at this moment it seems necessary to situate the capital of Asante (Ghana), Kumasi, on Ithaca. Kumasi is the new reality of Ithaca; it symbolizes our contemporary, existent world. It stands for the multilayered reality of a network society to which academia has to adapt itself. Odysseus’ dog could guide our hero to Kumasi, this dynamic city, where Appiah (2007) sees an illustration of a contemporary “cosmopolitan contamination.” In the different networks of a network society subtle tensions and influences are to be discovered between premodern, modern, and postmodern types of networks. When Giddens (1991, in Platenkamp, 2007) referred to modernity as “a risk culture in which reflexivity and reskilling, based on local knowledge of day-to-day life are combined with systems of ‘accumulated expertise’ with its dis-embedding and deskilling influences”

(p. 28) he still did not include most people in the developed societies. The abstract systems of Giddens penetrate in different ways into the local, regional, and national lives of the non-Western world. Also, the capital of Ghana is integrated into the global markets, which does not make it American, British, or Western.

English, German, Chinese, Syrian, Lebanese, Ivorian, Nigerian, Indian: I can find you families of each description. I can find you Asante people, whose ancestors have lived in this town for centuries, but also Hausa households that have been around for centuries, too. There are people there from all the regions, speaking all the scores of languages of Ghana as well. (Appiah, 2007, pp. 101–102)

When you understand cosmopolitanism well, says Appiah (2007), you think human variety matters “because people are entitled to the options they need to shape their lives in partnership with others (p. 104). The writing of a very cosmopolitan writer from (African) Latin antiquity, Publius Terentius Afro, quoted by Appiah, was known to Roman *littérateurs* as contamination. “*Quot homines, tot sententiae*” was his observation: “so many men, so many opinions.” Salman Rushdie is another eloquent exponent of the same attitude, but now in a network society, where he said that the novel that occasioned his fatwa:

celebrates hybridity, impurity, intermingling, the transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings, cultures, ideas, politics, movies, songs. It rejoices in mongrelization and fears the absolutism of the Pure. *Mélange*, hotchpotch, a bit of this and a bit of that is how newness enters the world. (Appiah, 2007, p. 112)

The description by Amoamo (2011) of the hybridized Maori in New Zealand confirms this image in the tourism academy. Cosmopolitanism was invented by contaminators in various manners, not only as a consequence of modernization. This world of contamination has become our home. Or as Appiah (2007) claims: “we do not need, have never needed, settled community a homogeneous system of values, in order to have a home” (p. 113). A “paradigm” in tourism studies suggests a warm home for like-minded researchers. These academics

stay on their island forever and resist any potential of another place. They will never choose the sea and its adventures, because it contains “adventure, heroism, and the quest for the unknown.” Some tourism researchers dare to leave their island in order to discover social sciences not in its absolute pureness, but in the richness of its variety. When a student in tourism management dares to look beyond the “quantitative horizon” of the positivist academics, she will discover the pragmatic reality of (participant) observations, in-depth interviews, stories, and visual methodologies that enriches her horizon in a substantial manner. Managers in the tourism industry will experience the added value of these studies directly and recognize academics as potential allies instead of villagers of a faraway island, still untouched by cosmopolitan contamination. In general, looking at a network society in which premodern, modern, and postmodern elements are interfering in various networks, “paradigms” have come into existence with varying perspectives on these interfering networks as well. According to the principle of cosmopolitan contamination researchers are not expected to ignore the place of their origins, their “paradigms.” But at the same time they fear the absolutism of the pure, that is part of this paradigmatic situation, and they are eager to leave their homes in search for new insights that might be enriching.

#### Knowledge Production in Kumasi on Ithaca

But how do we organize these intersubjective dialogs between “paradigms?” If the ultimate “paradigm” on Ithaca is represented by the network society of Kumasi, can we say something about the basic rules in this network study of tourism? The most important tourism magazines, to start with, would be smart if they would move their headquarters to Kumasi. But more important: how does this cosmopolitan contamination look like in tourism studies on Ithaca? Looking at the contamination part of this question, it seems necessary to give the floor to the humanities and their strong attention to the interpretive power in grasping the needed context of a research project. Levuka, as we have seen, illustrates this case of starting with an interpretive (emic) approach, where later on the “etic” one proves its value. As stated earlier (Fisher, 2004),

there were three groups with their own interpretations in Levuka, who should be involved in the construction of meaning of this former colonial town, the ethnic Fijians, the "old" Europeans, and the Indo-Fijian and Chinese shopkeepers. All three are to be included in a more refined (hermeneutical) understanding of this cultural heritage. At the same time the cosmopolitan part of our question tries to identify universals that might be useful for the common concept of cultural heritage. This position of "distanciation" (Ricoeur, 1981) is not the privileged position of the objectivist scientist alone, but also belongs to the reflections of all parties involved which try to identify universals in relation to this situation of cultural heritage. There are more "contextualized" or "cosmopolitan contaminated" observers in the context of tourism studies and in this intersubjective dialog between "paradigms."

The fact that many tourism researchers have doubts about the in discipline of tourism studies (Tribe, 1997) might also be seen as an advantage for the field of tourism studies. In tourism studies, as in tourism management, we may look beyond the limits of the so-called "paradigms" of social-scientific disciplines. Tourism studies already has a tradition of interdisciplinary research since its origins. This tradition also enables a more flexible response to the multilayered reality of the academic and managerial situation. A limitation to different "paradigms" or islands would imply a brutal stop in the unending and promising quest that tourism studies should be. Tourism studies as a multilayered field of research offers the opportunity for a flexible but persistent discussion between different so-called "paradigms" from various sources. Let us not bother about the paradigmatic status of tourism studies and let us profit from the freedom that this rejection of the paradigmatic status will create in tourism research. A sophisticated direction of loosely structuring this new situation in tourism studies could be the mentioned distinction between three modes of knowledge production. In social sciences, as in tourism studies, all three modes are characterized by an organized form of criticism, pluralism, and reception and resistance. There will never be a paradigm on Ithaca in tourism studies, but as a "regulative principle" Ithaca promises a discussion in the whole archipelago that will

disturb all the "paradigmatic believers" who stay on their different islands.

In mode 1 of tourism studies there will be an unending discussion about the contributions of the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. The main principle, here, is inclusion and not exclusion, although the discussion on academic criteria will never end. Therefore, "how, in pluralistic societies with a diverse ethnic mix (in a creolising world, VP) is it possible to narrate histories that include all constituent variants equitably?" (Dann & Seaton, 2001, p. 25).

The tension between "explanation" and "interpretation" in tourism studies is not a problem to be solved but a rich source of new developments for which inclusion and not exclusion is the most justified approach. Various contextualized voices are to be given all the space they need, but subsequently there also should be a universalizing confrontation of the value of all these voices and their confrontations in an organized, critical manner. Many topics emerge that require more investigation within the context of this confrontation:

Mixtures of traditional networks with a tribal, Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist or Christian background are one of them. What influence do these mixtures have on sex tourism but also on educational systems, gender relations, values like respect or freedom, particularistic networks in labor markets, race relations and leisure? How does modernization come into the picture with what type of consequences for community feeling versus democracy or indifference in the private space? What thoughts are dominant in differences of opinion about sexuality or leisure and tourism in different types of economy? How can post-communism in former Eastern Europe, in China or in Mongolia be characterized? How does the free market system influence these societies in the field of tourism and leisure? (Platenkamp, 2007, p. 227)

In this network society there is a growing lack of tentative and explorative answers to this type of question. Contextualized knowledge, gathered according to the often subtle approaches from humanities, is necessary and a serious discussion in a decontextualized climate can only take place after this phase of contextualization. In mode 1 of knowledge production in the tourism field this academic discussion is a very promising challenge that, however, is hardly stimulated until now. The



main reason for this is the parochial domain that each so-called “paradigm” creates for itself and the ridiculous unbelief that something reasonable could take place on the other islands. Where are the conferences during which different islanders flock together and challenge each other in a constructive and yet critical and contaminated cosmopolitan (Appiah, 2007) attitude of reception and resistance (Said, 2004)? Or should we listen more carefully to the art of sophisticated journalism where participants follow this path in a more self-evident manner? If we become more modest in our scientific pretensions and are not envious about the reputation of natural scientists anymore, (mixtures of) intellectual traditions can be elaborated and nuanced in a much more challenging way that tries to give an answer to the complicated questions of a network society. Kumasi on Ithaca will be our guideline, also when frustrations abandon.

Also, mode 2 of knowledge production requires a more decided contextual approach in order to handle the growing complexity in international research and education in and around tourism development. For example, complex contextual learning processes take place that are not taken into account seriously enough within the education and research milieu of the field. Fieldwork components play a crucial part in this education and in both bachelor and Tourism Destination Management (TDM) master’s programs at the NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands, the fieldwork component “has become both a pivot and a pillar, feeding the overall tourism curriculum, both in content and design” (Portegies, de Haan, Isaac, & Roovers, 2011; Portegies, de Haan, & Platenkamp, 2009; Portegies, Platenkamp, & de Haan, 2014). This fieldwork is the open space where mode 2 knowledge production takes place, and

Where students can apply their talents for observation, exploration and making their own discoveries. In that same open space practitioners share their successes and failures. More importantly, there is room to discuss and exchange uncertainties about current livelihood practices, potential market developments and the unknown. Professionals and entrepreneurs of all sorts and sizes play an important role in the fieldwork. These people pragmatically cooperate with students and lecturers as part of an experience of “learning on the spot,” constantly aware of the uncertainties

and of the limits of knowledge. (Portegies et al., 2014, p. 348)

In this process there was a growing accent on postdisciplinary research, as well as a deepening of the study of decontextualization and recontextualization practices. This refers to a “collaborative effort of academics from various disciplines and practitioners from many sides who jointly and without pre-established hierarchy are working in an innovative manner with complex and emergent practices by focusing on both context-dependent and context-independent characteristics” (Portegies et al., 2014, p. 349). In this pragmatic design for contextual learning focused interests of stakeholders in tourism destinations were more intensely paid attention to. For example, in Bali “small business operates within a context of larger interests. In this climate, small, independent food outlets were tolerated as long as they didn’t sell beer (alcohol) and they conformed with what the highly competitive syndicates dictated” (Portegies et al., 2014, p. 351). This type of information evolved from the repeated conversations of students with the same players in the destination. This inspiring learning context exemplifies how mode 2 knowledge production might be organized in diverse tourism contexts. Here too, Kumasi on Ithaca offers the inspiring image of a respectful, free, and (self-) critical knowledge production in the professional tourism contexts of a network society.

Mode 3 is an emergent form of knowledge production and tourism could play a crucial role here too (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010). It has been introduced (Kunnean, 2005; Platenkamp, 2007) in the awareness that there is a long-term tendency in mode 1 and 2 to exclude the “slow questions” related to sickness, death, repression but also to moral virtues as compassion, inner strength, or wisdom and other sources of existential fulfillment that remain crucial for all generations in a variety of places. For example:

In the reflections of tourism developers in Burma, moral questions that are related to injustice, human rights, and the everyday life of local people are excluded in their context of application. As a consequence, original villages have been destroyed, local people removed, and human rights violated for the sake of tourism development. Professionals

who abstract from these circumstances do not consider this moral aspect, but focus only on the viability of tourism business. (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2013, p. 178)

Economic and political power constellations, but also dogmatically defended frames of interpretation, constitute obstacles to the necessary development of learning processes in mode 3. Therefore, a relative autonomous development of mode 3 should be claimed that supports more adequate interventions in tourism professional practices. Dissensus and incommensurability (the logical disconnectness of different positions) is as possible in the argumentation structure of this mode as consensus. In the hybridized network society of Kumasi on Ithaca consensus is not the necessary outcome of an ethical discussion between various “transcendent” values and perspectives. Values need not be but can be incommensurable and in mode 3 discussions of these differences are included by understanding them as the expression of a plurality of perspectives. In this discussion there is no Archimedean last point of anchorage, but a “horizontal, transcendent orientation in which there is openness, receptivity and criticism.” A clear example of such a discussion has been presented in an article (Isaac, Platenkamp, & Cakmak, 2013) that questions the alleged neutral objectivity in social scientific discussions through the relevant example of how academics concealed their positions of neutrality just before the 86th annual tourism conference of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), October 2010 in Jerusalem. The article analyzed “the relatively high amount of email reactions to a Palestinian tourism scholar who called for support from the tourism academic community for the rejection of Jerusalem as the place where the conference would be held.” A mode 3 discussion has been suggested in this article in order to stimulate a climate “of broader enlightenment that ultimately goes beyond the perspectives of individual parties.” Here, too, reception and resistance remain relevant, but also the critical attempt to replace the argument of power by the power of argumentation as it suits well in an intellectual tradition where moral discussions do not only consist of expert exposés that analyze the moral traditions in different times and places but also consist of taking well-argued

sides in the awareness that the other might always be right. Ethical discussions come closer but also become more contextualized in a hybridized network society. In Kumasi on Ithaca, slow questions are taken into serious account.

### Reviews Editor Note

Readers of *Tourism Analysis* who are inspired to respond to the views of Professor Platenkamp on the conceivable need (with Greek or other epistemological characteristics!) for dialog across the paradigms are invited to send a 1,000 to 2,000 word commentary or critique of this review article. Such a response should be sent by e-mail to the Reviews Editor for *Tourism Analysis* (Keith Hollinshead) at [khdeva@btopenworld.com](mailto:khdeva@btopenworld.com).

### References

- Amoamo, M. (2011) Tourism and hybridity: Re-visiting Bhabha's third space. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1254–1273.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a world of strangers*. London: Penguin Group.
- Botterill, D., & Platenkamp, V. (2012). *Key concepts in tourism research*. London: Sage.
- Butler, R. W. (Ed.) (2006). *The tourist area life cycle volume 2: Conceptual and theoretical issues*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Cohen, H. F. (2010). *How modern science came into the world*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Cook, T. (1985). Postpositivist critical multiplism. In R. Shotland & M. Mark (Eds.), *Social science and social policy* (pp. 21–63). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dann, G., & Seaton, A. V. (Eds.) (2001). *Slavery, contested heritage and thanatourism*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against method*. London: Verso.
- Fisher, D. (2004). A colonial town for neocolonial tourism. In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (Eds.), *Tourism and post-colonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations* (pp. 126–139). London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1966). *Les mots et les choses*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Gadamer, H. (1990). *Wahrheit und methode*. Tübingen, Germany: JCB Mohr.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge. Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. London: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hollinshead, K. (2009) The “worldmaking” prodigy of tourism: The reach and power of tourism in the dynamics

- of change and transformation. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(1), 139–152.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1969). *Dialektik der aufklärung*. Frankfurt am Main: Fisher Verlag.
- Isaac, R., & Platenkamp, V. (2010). Moving from pilgrimage to responsible tourism: The case of Palestine. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(6), 579–590.
- Isaac, R., Platenkamp, V., & Cakmak, E. (2013). Message from paradise: Critical reflections on the tourism academy in Jerusalem. *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, 12(2/3), 159–173.
- Isaas, R., & Platenkamp, V. (2013). Ethnography of hope in extreme places: Arendt's agora in controversial tourism destinations. *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, 12(2/3), 173–187.
- Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 63–82.
- Kolakowski, L. (1978) *Main currents of Marxism: Its origins, growth and dissolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kunneman, H. (2005) *Voorbij het dike-ik*. Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij SWP.
- Lengkeek, J., & Platenkamp, V. (2004). *The international classroom of tourism studies*. Paper presented at an international conference for sociologists on Lesbos, Greece.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Nisbet, R. A. (1966). *The sociological tradition*. London: Heinemann.
- Platenkamp, V. (2007). *Contexts in tourism and leisure studies. A cross-cultural contribution to the production of knowledge*. Wageningen, Netherlands: Wageningen University Press.
- Platenkamp, V., & Botterill, D. (2013). Critical realism, rationality and tourism knowledge. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 110–129.
- Portegies, A., de Haan, T., Isaac, R., & Roovers, L. (2011) Understanding Cambodian tourism development. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 11, 103–116.
- Portegies, A., de Haan, T., & Platenkamp, V. (2009). Knowledge production in tourism: The evaluation of contextual learning processes in destination studies. *Tourism Analysis*, 14, 523–536.
- Portegies, A., Platenkamp, V., & de Haan, T. (2014). Embedded research. A pragmatic design for contextual learning—from fieldtrip to fieldwork to field research in Australasia. In D. Dredge, D. Airey, & M. J. Gross (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of tourism and hospitality education* (pp. 348–356). London and New York: Routledge.
- Popper, K. R. (1972). *Objective knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneuticals & the human sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Said, E. (2004). *Humanism and democratic criticism*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638–657.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: Nicholas Brealey.